



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,284	12/30/2003	Tiao-Hung Hsiao	B-5337 621606-5	2377
36716	7590	02/07/2006		
LADAS & PARRY 5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			EXAMINER RIELLEY, ELIZABETH A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/751,284

Applicant(s)

HSIAO, TIAO-HUNG

Examiner

Elizabeth A. Rielley

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Amendment filed 11/25/05 has been entered and considered by the Examiner. Currently, claims 1-15 are pending in the instant application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 5-9, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al (US 20030146446).

In regard to claims 1 and 2, Yamazaki et al ('446) teach an organic electroluminescent display device (figures 10 and 18), comprising: a glass substrate (11; paragraphs 96, 140, and 141); an optic-compensation film of transparent dielectric material formed on the surface of the glass substrate that is made from silicon nitride (12; paragraphs 140, 96, and 141); an anode layer formed on the optic-compensation film (25; paragraph 103); a laminated body of organic material formed on the anode layer (27; paragraphs 103 and 2); and a cathode layer formed on the laminated body (28; paragraph 106). Yamazaki et al ('446) continues to teach that the anode layer (25; see figure 18) being directly on an optic-compensation film (1801; paragraph 142 teaches that this film is a transparent dielectric material).

In regard to claims 5 and 13, Yamazaki et al ('446) teach the anode layer is ITO (paragraph 6).

In regard to claims 6 and 14, Yamazaki et al ('446) teach forming a hole-injecting layer (802; figure 8a; paragraph 77) formed on the anode layer (801); an organic luminescent material layer formed on the hole-injecting layer (804; paragraphs 77 and 2); and an electron-injecting layer formed on the organic luminescent material layer (806).

In regard to claims 7 and 15, Yamazaki et al ('446) teach the organic electroluminescent display device is an OLED device or a PLED device (paragraph 2).

In regard to claims 8 and 9, Yamazaki et al ('446) teach a method of forming an organic electroluminescent display device (figures 18 and 10A), comprising: providing a glass substrate (11; paragraphs 140-141 and 95-108); forming an optic-compensation film of transparent dielectric material on the surface of the glass substrate, made from silicon nitride (paragraph 96) in which the transparent nature of the optic-compensation film is not limited to light of a specific wavelength made from silicon nitride (12; paragraphs 140, 96, and 14; the Examiner notes that Yamazaki et al do not specifically state that the optic-compensation film is not limited to light of a specific wavelength, however, since it is transparent 'to visible light' as understood by paragraphs 140, 141, 96 as well as figure 18, therefore it is not limited to a specific wavelength but all visible light); forming an anode layer (25) on the optic-compensation film; forming a laminated body of organic material on the anode layer (27); and forming a cathode layer on the laminated body (28). Yamazaki et al ('446) continues to teach that the anode layer (25; see figure 18) being formed directly on an optic-compensation film (1801; paragraph 142 teaches that this film is a transparent dielectric material).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (US 20030146446) in view of Yamazaki et al (US 6815723).

In regard to claims 3 and 10, Yamazaki ('446) is silent regarding the limitation of the optic-compensation film is 100-3000 angstroms thick. Yamazaki et al ('723) teach an optic compensation film made from silicon nitrate that is 100-3000 angstroms thick (column 14 lines 51-58) in order to for light to pass through (column 10 lines 4-22). Hence it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the display of Yamazaki et al ('446) with the SiNx thickness of Yamazaki et al ('723). Motivation to combine would be to allow more light to pass through the display.

In regard to claims 4 and 11-12, Yamazaki et al ('446) are silent regarding the limitations that the optic compensation film promotes transparency of red light to approximately 90% thereby increasing the transparency of red light. However, since Yamazaki et al ('446) in view of Yamazaki et al ('723) teach a display with a transparent silicon nitrate film that is between 100-3000 angstroms thick, it would have naturally promoted the transparency of the red light to approximately 90% thereby increasing the transparency of red light, since Yamazaki et al ('446) in view of ('723) meet all the claimed recitations of

Art Unit: 2879

the final product manufactured. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the display of Yamazaki et al ("446) with the SiNx thickness of Yamazaki et al ('723), thereby naturally obtaining a transparency of red light to approximately 90% thereby increasing the transparency of red light. Motivation to combine would be to allow more light to pass through the display.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 11/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to Applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to teach the anode layer formed directly on an optic-compensation film, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Yamazaki teaches the anode layer (25; see figure 18) being directly on an optic-compensation film (1801; paragraph 142 teaches that this film is a transparent dielectric material).

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action


Art Unit: 2879

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Rielley whose telephone number is 571-272-2117. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Elizabeth Rielley

Examiner  
Art Unit 2879

  
MARICELI SANTIAGO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER